

Glacier Bay Compensation Plan Conference Call

Meeting Summary Final

June 1, 2000 Call
3:00-5:00 PM

Introduction

The fifth and final Spring 2000 public teleconference call was held on June 1 from 3:00 to 5:30 p.m.¹ The objectives of the call were to:

- Continue to review and discuss issues related to the draft Economic Assessment of the impacts of Glacier Bay closures and restrictions;
- To discuss the draft list of questions and issues associated with development of a draft compensation plan;
- To review the schedule and discuss options for public input and feedback on a draft compensation plan in the fall, and
- To identify any remaining questions parties have before adjourning the public involvement process for the summer.

A total of 36 individuals were on the call, participating from the communities of Angoon, Elfin Cove, Gustavus, Haines, Hoonah, Juneau, Pelican and Petersburg. The agenda and list of conference call participants are attached

An effort was made prior to the call to provide interested parties with copies of the documents to be discussed during the call. These included:

- *Glacier Bay Compensation Plan Supplement to the Economic Assessment – Community Impacts* (developed by Jim Calvin, The McDowell Group)
- *Draft Questions and Issues for Draft Compensation Plan Development* (developed by Randy King, NPS)

Dick HofMann, Program Manager, ADF&G, faxed the documents to those participants on the call who indicated that they had not received them earlier.

Summary of Discussion

I. Issues and Questions Related to the *Draft* Economic Assessment

¹ By agreement of the participants on the call, the call was extended beyond the originally scheduled end-time of 5:00 p.m.

Capital Assets

The issue of how losses of capital investment will be handled in the Compensation Program has been raised on previous calls and other forums. Jim Calvin (McDowell Group) took a few minutes to explain how this issue has been approached in developing the Draft Economic Assessment and the rationale behind it.

Mr. Calvin explained that when someone makes an investment in a boat or a processing plant, they do so with the expectation that the investment will generate a monetary return -- that investment will generate income over time. If government takes some action that makes it impossible to generate income from that investment, the government can compensate people in one of two ways; it can replace the income that the investment would have generated or it can replace the original investment, but not both.

A plan that involved fully compensating both lost future income and capital investment would amount to double-counting. Therefore, capital investment is not separately considered in the Economic Assessment, but is assumed to be covered in the determination of lost future income.

In response to Mr. Calvin's explanation, the following comments and concerns were raised:

- A question was raised about the precedent set by the Dungeness crab buy-out with respect to capital assets. In addition to compensation for future income from harvests, the National Park Service (NPS) bought boats and gear from crabbers.

Mr. Calvin acknowledged that in this regard it could be argued that the Dungeness Crab buy-out involved some double-counting, setting a complicated precedent. However, he pointed-out that the Dungeness buy-out program was a negotiated process specific to that fishery and completed separately from the overall Compensation Program. The overall Compensation Program is being developed independent of the Dungeness crab program.

- There may be cases where the proportion of income to a specific business that is attributable to Glacier Bay harvest is such that its loss makes it impossible to stay in business. Without being able to roll the asset into some other utilization that generates income, a business could fail.

Mr. Calvin responded by acknowledging the complexity of this issue. He pointed-out that if the loss of volume of business attributable to Glacier Bay causes a business to fail, then the compensation should cover the full loss. He noted that some specific cases will have to be looked at individually in this regard, with the assistance of certified public accountants to help measure the extent of loss attributable to Glacier Bay closures and restrictions.

- The value of the assets of non-Glacier Bay fishermen who face increased competition from displaced Glacier Bay fishermen are likely to decrease (e.g. the capital value of their permits will be worth less). Will this be compensated?

Mr. Calvin indicated that these losses are implicitly included in the losses measured by the Economic Assessment. However, the mechanism for determining how much the compensation should be will be complicated and has not yet been identified.

Community Impacts Supplement

Ms. Langstaff noted that on the previous (May 27) conference call, the discussion of the Community Impacts supplement to the draft Economic Assessment was constrained by the fact that most participants had not had sufficient opportunity to read the document. There were few questions or comments on this document per se, but regarding community impacts, one participant noted: 1) the smaller communities with very high dependence on Glacier Bay fisheries will be more affected than larger more diverse communities, and 2) the effects on communities will last longer into the future than for individual fishermen. Beyond the lifetime losses of fishermen, the losses will be perpetual for communities. Therefore, it was argued, compensation should be longer-term than a one-time payment. It was suggested that to mitigate this, some mechanism be initiated to provide some part of the income generated from tourism in Glacier Bay National Park be earmarked for these communities and used for economic development initiatives to help keep people employed in the communities. This could take the form of a “head tax,” or some proportion of Park Service revenues from Glacier Bay tourism activities. It was further suggested that under such a scenario, less of the funds in the Compensation Program would be allocated to communities, leaving more available for other appropriate recipients. Other options for communities might include non-monetary “compensation” in the form of loan programs or occupational training programs.

Other Questions, Concerns, Comments related to the draft Economic Assessment

The following additional comments were provided:

- A concern was raised about whether or not the tax implications of compensation received by fishermen and others were being addressed. The potential for a one-time payment (instead of income over many years) being taxed as capital gains is a potential problem. Mr. Calvin noted that the Economic Assessment was based on re-tax losses and indicated he was unsure how the IRS handles lump-sum compensation payments like this. It was noted that for the Dungeness Crab buy-out, there was no provision in the law to mitigate the tax implications.

One participant noted that according to the Alaska Exchange Corporation, if people received compensation and re-invested it in a like business within 180 days, they were not required to pay taxes on it (until such time in the future when they liquidate).

- A question was raised about whether and how the Economic Assessment takes into account losses associated with the investment of time and effort in learning about the

Glacier Bay area in order to fish there successfully. Mr. Calvin responded that the EA implicitly takes this into consideration.

- Concern was expressed about the possibility of future additional closures or other decisions that would further limit what can be done even with a Lifetime Access Permit, and whether losses due to this are being considered. In response, it was explained that this would be outside the scope of the current task which applies only to the closures and restrictions in the current law.

II. Review and Comment on the draft *Questions and Issues for Draft Compensation Plan Development*

Randy King of the National Park Service provided an introduction and orientation to the list of questions and issues developed for consideration in the development of the draft compensation plan. He noted that, to date, focus has been on the Economic Assessment and on identification of the categories, groups, and sub-groups of affected parties who may be eligible for compensation. The next step is to determine what are the appropriate eligibility criteria, and how to allocate the funds (what sort of compensation “formula” should be used). These are areas in which the law provides almost no direction. He emphasized that this document represents an attempt to capture the full range of issues that need to be addressed in developing a compensation plan. He further emphasized that it is a work in progress and that it will be changed as constructive suggestions are received.

He explained that, to a large extent, the document reflects what has been heard so far from interested parties through the early interviews, open houses, the public conference calls, as well as informal discussions of interested parties with Park Service and/or state officials. He further emphasized the desire of the NPS to receive as much input as possible from affected parties regarding the issues and questions that should be considered in devising a compensation plan that is fair and uniformly applied, explaining that no decision has been made about how to answer these questions. Once the NPS is assured that the right questions and issues have been identified, the next step will be to solicit input from interested parties regarding how the compensation plan should address these questions. The draft Compensation Plan will have to answer these questions and provide the rationale to support the eligibility criteria and compensation formula it proposes.

Mr. King explained that the *Questions and Issues* document will be revised based on input from this call, and then circulated broadly (through the June issue of the Newsletter and on the Park Service web site). Comments on how the issues should be addressed in the Compensation Plan will be welcome up until November 30, but would be most appreciated before August 1st so that they can be considered in the development of the initial drafting of the compensation plan. The NPS plans to begin drafting on August first, and to have a draft plan (with concurrence of the State) for comment in mid-September.

Mr. King asked that participants on this call focus their comments on how to improve the draft *Questions and Issues* document - whether or not the right questions and issues have been

identified and appropriately framed, and whether there are key issues that are missing that should be added.

Participants provided the following feedback on the *Questions and Issues* document:

- The introduction or background section of the *Questions and Issues* document should be clear on how much the law does prescribe and how much it does not, especially with respect to those affected by the restrictions. Also, with respect to what is required of applicants for compensation, (e.g. the legislation specifically refers to the need for a sworn affidavits).
- The way the questions are worded makes it look as if the NPS is attempting to exclude as many options as possible. Most questions are “should” questions, implying a yes or no response.

Mr. King explained that this was not the intention of the NPS at all, and agreed to attempt to re-phrase the questions to avoid making this impression – he requested assistance in re-framing the questions so that they are more open-ended.

- It was suggested that the question of whether and/or how to compensate for the loss of lifestyle and family tradition be added to the list. This question has been raised before, and it has been noted that it is subjective and extremely difficult to quantify, making it very difficult to factor into the economic assessment. Parties were encouraged to provide any suggestions for how one might go about this. Some participants responded by noting that compensation to the communities can in some ways address this, by helping to secure the future of the community and enabling families to continue living and working in them.

Question #3 under the Permit Holder category refers to “displacement effects”. This term should be defined so that other readers understand what this refers to.

In addition to providing feedback on the appropriateness and thoroughness of the questions, participants on the call also offered specific responses to some of the questions of particular interest to them. For example:

- *Regarding Eligibility Criteria, Questions 1-3:* Some expressed concern about including a base qualifying years requirement due to discomfort over potentially excluding any of their colleagues on the docks – suggesting that while fishermen must have fished in Glacier Bay, the qualifying years should be as minimally restrictive as possible. Others felt that some period of base qualifying years criteria is very important and it should be designed to protect or favor those who have actively fished in (or relied on fish from) Glacier Bay in recent years – not someone who was involved for one year in 1935! Others suggested that length of activity, as well as recent participation, should both be factors.
- *Regarding Eligibility Criteria, Question 5:* At least one participant indicated that parties not directly affected by restrictions in Glacier Bay should not be eligible for

compensation. Others noted that there needs to be a limit, but some decision needs to be made, regarding how many concentric ripples are in, and which are out.

- *Regarding Eligibility Criteria (for LAP fisheries), Question 2:* At least one participant indicated strong opinion that LAP holders should indeed be compensated for loss of access to wilderness areas – provided they can provide documentation of their historic use of those areas.
- *Regarding Compensation, Question 1:* Preference was expressed for a compensation approach that considers documented individual loss rather than an approach that applies some basic allocation to all parties.
- *Regarding Compensation, Question 5:* Several participants expressed the opinion that it would not be an appropriate use of the funds to cover legal or CPA costs for developing and substantiating claims. Many won't use lawyers or others for this purpose, and those who choose to should cover their own costs.

Following discussion of the *Questions and Issues* document, Mr. King explained that the document will be revised and distributed in the June newsletter, and that the NPS looks forward to receiving feedback on how these questions and issues should be addressed in the compensation plan as soon as possible (no later than November 30, but preferably before August 1st, when drafting will begin in earnest).

The timeline for development of the draft Compensation Plan and for public input was then reviewed:

- **July 1, 2000 – Deadline for Comments on Economic Assessment**
- **August 1, 2000 – Final Economic Assessment will be published** and available in hard copy and on the NPS web site.
- **August-September 2000 – NPS develop Draft Compensation Plan with concurrence of state**
- **Mid-September, 2000 – Draft Compensation Plan available to public.**
- **October 15-November 30, 2000 – Open houses/public meetings** will be held in all affected communities to discuss and hear comment on draft Compensation Plan.
- **November 30, 2000 – Comment period closes on draft Compensation Plan.**
- **December, 2000 – NPS Finalize Compensation Plan**
- **January 2001 – Compensation Plan completed and published in federal register.**

III. Review of Schedule and Comments on fall 2000 Public Involvement Process

Finally, Ms. Langstaff asked participants whether they felt that scheduling conference calls in the early fall would be desirable. Most participants found it difficult to say, without knowing what the draft Compensation Plan will look like. Jim Calvin (McDowell Group) indicated that he had found the feedback on these first calls very helpful in developing the Economic Assessment, and suggested that further calls be considered as a useful option for feedback on the draft Compensation Plan. One participant asked if the NPS had found the calls useful and how much

weight the NPS will put on the input gathered on the calls and from comments submitted over the next few months. Mr. King and Mr. Millett of the NPS reiterated that the Service fully intends to use the input received from the public in making decisions about how to structure the Compensation Plan. The NPS is responsible for producing the plan, with concurrence of the State, but would like the input of affected parties to inform and guide its development.

Participants urged that the public involvement process in the fall be planned well ahead of time, that information materials get out to parties in a timely fashion, and that the schedule established be adhered to in order to enable full and meaningful participation of interested parties. This should apply to any public meetings/open houses, conference calls, or other mechanisms being considered.

Finally, NPS and State officials thanked the call participants for their contributions, and urged them to provide additional comments to the NPS (Clark Millett) or State (Dick HofMann).

The call adjourned at approximately 5:20 p.m.

Attachment A

Glacier Bay Compensation Plan

Conference Call 5

Thursday, June 1, 2000

3:00-5:00 p.m.

1-888-819-5868

Objectives of Call:

- 1) To continue to review and discuss *draft* Economic Assessment
- 2) to provide an opportunity for interested parties to highlight issues and concerns regarding the Economic Assessment
- 3) to discuss the list of Draft Questions and Issues associated with development of a draft compensation plan;
- 4) to review the schedule and discuss options for public input and feedback on a draft compensation plan in the fall; and
- 5) to answer any remaining questions parties have before adjourning for the summer.

Proposed Agenda

3:00 – 3:10 Welcome, Introductions and Review Agenda

Lee Langstaff, RESOLVE

3:10 – 3:30 Update on Economic Assessment - Jim Calvin – McDowell Group

- Community Impacts comments and issues (how to assess impacts to incorporated and nonincorporated communities)
- Capital Assets, current status of how capital assets are treated in Economic Assessment
- Questions, issues concerns parties would like to provide to NPS

3:30 – 4:40 Review and comment on draft Questions and Issues for Public Review for Compensation Plan? – Randy King (NPS) and All

- Orientation to and overview of Draft Questions and Issues - Linking the Economic Assessment with how to structure the Compensation Plan
- Walk through key issues and questions
- Discussion questions:
 - To what degree have we adequately framed the issues and questions associated with development of eligibility criteria and compensation formulas?
 - What do you think about these questions? How can we do better?
 - What other questions do you have that we should consider?

4:40 – 5:00 Review of Summer plans and feedback and comment on Public meetings to Be held in October and November. – Lee Langstaff

- Review of Compensation Plan development schedule
- Parties comments on how to make the public feedback on the compensation plan useful and productive.
- Do you think the NPS should sponsor open houses in your community? (If yes, why,? If not, why not?)

- Should we schedule additional public conference calls in the fall? If yes, what dates can we start? Do you have any suggestions for making the calls easier to participate in, more productive?
- Other comments/suggestions/ideas?

5:00

ADJOURN

Attachment B

Glacier Bay Compensation Plan Supplement to the Economic Assessment

Community Impacts

May 25, 2000

The purpose of this supplement is to present the draft assessment of the community level economic impacts stemming from commercial fishing restrictions in Glacier Bay National Park. This draft assessment is a supplement to the full working draft report dated May 15, 2000.

The Glacier Bay Compensation Plan Economic Assessment (Working Draft, May 15, 2000) provides preliminary estimates of losses suffered by commercial fishermen, crew, processors, their employees, and businesses that provide goods and services to fishermen and processors. The working draft does not include some of the indirect economic effects that communities and individuals within communities could experience.

Indirect impacts stem from circulation of money through an economy. There are two types of indirect impacts: true indirect impacts, which stem from spending by businesses in support of their operations, and induced impacts, which stem from household spending. For example, indirect impacts occur when a seafood processor or commercial fishermen purchases supplies locally, such as fuel, gear or equipment, shipping services, etc. Induced impacts occur when an employee of a processing plant, for example, spends his or her payroll locally.

Most of the indirect impacts of commercial fishing restrictions in Glacier Bay have already been estimated. These include variable expenditures made by processors and fishermen in support of their operations (see “losses to support businesses” in the full working draft). Indirect impacts not yet identified include potential impacts on sales and property tax revenues to local governments. Also, not included are the induced impacts – losses to local economies from reduced purchases of goods and services by households directly affected by fishing restrictions.

To summarize, following is a list of some of the indirect and induced losses (other than those already estimated) that could occur in communities affected by commercial fishing restrictions in Glacier Bay.

- Reduced residential and commercial property valuations for households and businesses not directly involved in the Glacier Bay fisheries. (Losses to those involved in the fisheries have already been considered.)

- Reduced sales in businesses not directly involved in the Glacier Bay fisheries (in addition to that already predicted for those business providing goods and services directly to the fishing and processing industries)
- Reduced property tax revenues to local governments (resulting from declining processor or other business property assessments, as well as declining residential assessments)
- Reduced sales tax revenues to local governments.
- Reduced employment and income opportunities in the private and public sectors resulting from reduced business sales and tax revenues.

In the absence of compensation to individuals and business directly affected by Glacier Bay fishing restrictions, estimating these potential indirect and induced losses would be a relatively simple matter of applying a multiplier to the direct losses. Multipliers provide a measure of the total economic impact of adding or subtracting jobs or income from an economy.

However, in theory, if all directly effected parties are fully compensated for their losses, then there would be no indirect or induced losses. This may be true from a very broad geographic perspective, but it is not true from the local perspective. Individuals and businesses receiving compensation are very unlikely to spend compensation money in the same places and at the same time as if the loss had not occurred. The challenge then is to predict indirect/induced losses to communities, recognizing that compensation paid to fishermen, processors, crew, support businesses and others will substantially – but not entirely – mitigate the indirect and induced impact on communities.

Multiplier Analysis

In the absence of very detailed economic modeling data on the local economies affected by Glacier Bay fishing restrictions, multipliers can be used to predict the magnitude of indirect/induced impacts of the Glacier Bay commercial fisheries. The actual multiplier effect of a commercial fishery on a community depends on several factors, including the residency of the harvesting and processing labor force, personal income generated by the fishery, and the ability of local businesses to meet the service and supply needs of fishery participants.

Multipliers can measure indirect and induced employment or income. Neither of these multipliers – even if available for the affected communities and fisheries – would work well for this analysis. Employment losses, while likely to occur, have not been measured in this study for those directly affected (therefore there is no base to apply a multiplier). Income losses have been measured in this study, however, the losses presented in the working draft are not purely income losses. The losses include business sales and fish taxes, along with income losses to fishermen, crew, processors and their employees.

Within the scope of this study, the best approach to measuring indirect and induced community losses is to apply a reasonable multiplier to the direct losses and make some

adjustment to account for the fact that most of the losses will be mitigated through compensation to directly affected parties. The working draft indicates that losses to fishermen, crew, processors, employees and support businesses could total \$27 million, given certain assumptions about discount rates and other factors (this total is quite likely to change before the economic assessment is completed). Based on a multiplier of 1.5 (a generally accepted multiplier for smaller communities in Alaska) total losses would equal \$40.5 million. This total includes \$27 million in direct losses and \$13.5 million in indirect/induced losses, if no compensation were given to directly affected parties.

However, because compensation will be given to directly-affected parties, actual indirect/induced losses to communities and other support businesses is theoretically zero. In reality, there will be losses to specific communities because the economic benefit stemming from expenditure of the compensation money will be redistributed. For example, money that would have been spent in Gustavus might now be spent in Juneau or Seattle. If it is assumed that this redistribution affects about 25 percent of the compensation award, losses to communities could total 25 percent of the potential indirect/induced loss of \$13.5 million, or approximately \$3.4 million. At the same time, gains by other communities (communities unaffected by Glacier Bay closures) could total \$3.4 million. There is a great deal of uncertainty in this analysis, but assuming actual losses to communities will be between 15 percent and 30 percent of the total potential indirect/induced loss, the present value of actual losses to communities could total from between \$2 million and \$4 million.²

This analysis does not include any attempt to quantify the potential loss of economic development *opportunity* associated with commercial fishing restrictions in Glacier Bay. For example, eventual closure of the Bay will constrain long-term seafood industry-related investment, employment growth and tax-base expansion in Gustavus, as well as Pelican and Hoonah. However, predicting these losses for communities would create inequities in the economic assessment because loss of opportunity has not been measured for fishermen (including fishermen who have no history of fishing in the Bay but have lost the opportunity to do so in the future), processors or other businesses.

Distribution of Community Losses

While this analysis provides a very broad estimate of the collective indirect/induced losses to communities affected by commercial fishing restrictions in Glacier Bay, it does not provide any indication of the losses to any specific community. Actual compensation to communities would be based on specific qualifying criteria (which have not yet been defined) and would reflect the unique impacts of Glacier Bay fishing restrictions on each community.

² For information on seafood industry multipliers in Alaska, see *The Alaska Fishing Industry: An Overview of State Expenditures and Economic Benefits*, House Research Agency Report 81-4, January 1982. Also see *Seafood Industry Sector Report*, Alaska Department of Commerce and Economic Development, May 1991, and *Tongass Land Management Plan Revision, Final Environmental Impact Statement, Part 2: chapter 3, Economic and Social Environment*, USDA Forest Service, January 1997.

Some data is available that reflects, in part, the relative importance of commercial fishing in Glacier Bay to various communities. The following table provides the number of fishermen in each fishery from each community that could qualify for lifetime access and the number of fishermen that have fished in Glacier Bay in recent years that do not qualify for lifetime access. As presented in the table, the number of halibut and tanner fishermen qualifying for lifetime access should be accurate. Rather than lifetime access, the dungeness data reflects the number of fishermen that qualified (according to fish ticket data) for buy-out and the number that did not. The data for trollers is the least accurate because it is based on landings during the qualifying years in all of Area 114, not just in Glacier Bay. It is likely that many of the trollers that qualify according to fish ticket data do not actually have the fishing history in the Bay to meet the NPS qualifying criteria for lifetime access.

Participation data does clearly indicates the comparatively high level of dependence of smaller communities on commercial fishing in Glacier Bay. For example, residents of Gustavus, a community with a population of 377 in 1999, hold 65 commercial fisheries permits potentially affected by Glacier Bay fishing restrictions (limitations with the salmon troll data notwithstanding). That's a permit-to-population percentage of 17 percent.³ This measure does not include Gustavus-based crew or processors and their employees who rely on the Glacier Bay harvest (Gustavus has two processors that were heavily dependent on the Glacier Bay dungeness harvest, as well as other products).

In Hoonah, the proportion of affected permits to population is 16 percent (Hoonah's population in 1999 was 877). Hoonah also has two processors with a history of dependence on Glacier Bay fisheries.

In Pelican, a community of 137 residents, the percentage is 39 percent. Among the communities most directly affected by fishing restrictions in Glacier Bay, Pelican is the most economically dependent on commercial fishing and is struggling to adjust to changes in the industry. Pelican's population has dropped by 40 percent since 1992, falling from 233 residents to 137 in 1999, according to Alaska Department of Labor data. This population loss is primarily the result of declining fish processing activity.

Elfin Cove is the community with the highest proportion of qualifying permits to population. That community of about 50 residents holds 42 potentially affected permits, or 84 percent.

Other communities are also affected by fishing restrictions in Glacier Bay but on a much smaller scale than Pelican, Hoonah and Gustavus. Affected permits as a percentage of total population is 3 percent in Sitka, 2 percent in Haines and Petersburg, and 1 percent in Juneau and Wrangell. All these communities also have processors affected by the closures and restrictions.

³ The number of affected permits does not necessarily reflect the number of affected permit holders because fishermen could hold permits in more than one fishery.

This comparative analysis provides only one, partial measure of the relative importance of Glacier Bay commercial fishing to communities. The analysis is limited in its accuracy because most of the *potentially* affected permits are in the salmon troll fishery and in fact many of these permit holders may not qualify for lifetime access (though no data is available to support that opinion). Further, the analysis does not include local crew or processing employees. The analysis also understates the relative impact on communities like Petersburg, where many of the region's tanner crab fishermen live. All permit holders in the tanner fishery will be affected by closure of Glacier Bay, not just those with a history of fishing in the Bay.

Summary

There is a great deal of uncertainty about how communities will be affected economically over the long-term by commercial fishing restrictions in Glacier Bay. However, using common-sense assumptions about multipliers and changes in spending patterns it is possible to at least express these impacts in terms of income losses. This assessment suggests that the present value of income losses to communities, in addition to those measured for permit holders, crew, processors, their employees and support businesses, could total between \$2 million and \$4 million. These estimates reflect lost economic benefit to households, businesses and local governments from reduced indirect and induced economic activity. These indirect/induced losses are in addition to losses in fish tax revenue suffered by communities that have historically earned such revenue, and communities that could at some point in the future have earned such revenue.

Participation in Glacier Bay Fisheries, By Community

Number of Fishermen Potentially Qualifying for Lifetime Access

	Lifetime Access	No Access	Total		Lifetime Access	No Access	Total
Gustavus				Juneau			
Halibut	6	6	12	Halibut	24	28	52
Salmon	16	9	25	Salmon	144	97	241
Tanner	9	4	13	Tanner	7	9	16
Dungeness	4	11	15	Dungeness	1	13	14
Total	35	30	65	Total	176	147	323
Hoonah				Wrangell			
Halibut	8	7	15	Halibut	4	1	5
Salmon	90	28	118	Salmon	8	14	22
Tanner	4	2	6	Tanner	1	1	2
Dungeness	0	1	1	Dungeness	1	1	2
Total	102	38	140	Total	14	17	31
Pelican				Sitka			
Halibut	5	3	8	Halibut	2	4	6
Salmon	31	11	42	Salmon	87	120	207
Tanner	1	1	2	Tanner	4	3	7
Dungeness	0	2	2	Dungeness	0	3	3
Total	37	17	54	Total	93	130	223
Elfin Cove				All Others			
Halibut	0	1	1	Halibut	9	16	25
Salmon	29	8	37	Salmon	110	249	359
Tanner	0	2	2	Tanner	3	8	11
Dungeness	1	1	2	Dungeness	0	23	23
Total	30	12	42	Total	122	296	418
Haines				Grand Totals			
Halibut	12	24	36	Halibut	74	92	166
Salmon	9	9	18	Salmon	535	575	1110
Tanner	1	1	2	Tanner	35	41	76
Dungeness	0	1	1	Dungeness	7	57	64
Total	22	35	57	Total	651	765	1416
Petersburg							
Halibut	4	2	6				
Salmon	11	30	41				
Tanner	5	10	15				
Dungeness	0	1	1				
Total	20	43	63				

Notes: Salmon includes power and hand troll fisheries. Tanner includes pot and ring fisheries. "No access" includes fishermen with landings in Glacier Bay (or most relevant statistical area) but not during the number of years required to qualify for lifetime access. Because of data limitations, the number of trollers actually qualifying for lifetime access is likely to be much smaller than is indicated by this data. "Lifetime access" for dungeness fishermen means fishermen that qualified for the buy-out. "No access" means those that did not qualify for the buyout.

Attachment C

Glacier Bay Compensation Plan
Conference Call

Thursday, June 1, 2000

Meeting Participants

John Baird
P.O. Box 1147
411 N. Nordic Drive
Petersburg, AK 99833
Phone: 9077724294
Fax: 9077724472
E-Mail: johnba@icicleseafoods.com

Terry Barry
P.O. Box 470
Hoonah, AK 99829
Phone: 907/ 945-3264
Fax: 907/945-3441
E-Mail: hcs@hoonah.net

Russell Barton
Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:

Gipper Beasley
Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:

James Calvin
McDowell Group
416 Harris Street, Suite 301
P.O. Box 21009
Juneau, AK 99802
Phone: 907/586-6126
Fax: 907/586-2673
E-Mail: jim.calvin@mcdowellgroup.net

Johanna K. Dybdahl
P.O. Box 602
254 Roosevelt Street
Hoonah, AK 99829
Phone: 907/ 945-3545
Fax: 907/945-3703
E-Mail: JDybd1111@aol.com

Joe Emerson
10410 Dock Street
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: 9077891200
Fax:
E-Mail: wildfish@alaska.net

Zach Falcon
P.O. Box 20243
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: 9075863340
Fax:
E-Mail: zpfalcon@romea.com

Vince Hansen
P.O. Box 1049
Haines, AK 99827
Phone: 9077662231
Fax: 9077663179
E-Mail:

Dick HofMann
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
P.O. Box 25526
1255 W. 8th, 99801
Juneau, AK 998025526
Phone: 9074656134

Fax: 9074656134
E-Mail: dick_hofmann@fishgame.state.ak.us
Norman Hughes
Box 1136
Haines, AK 99827
Phone: 9077662831
Fax:
E-Mail: stormin@seaknet.alaska.edu

Walter Jack
P.O. Box 45
Angoon, AK 99820
Phone: 907/788-3572
Fax:
E-Mail:

Dale Kelley
130 Seward Street, No. 505
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: 9075867940
Fax: 9075864473
E-Mail: ata@gci.net

Randy King
Phone: 907/697-2654
Fax:
E-Mail: Randy_King@nps.gov

Floyd Kookesh
P.O. Box 189
700 Aandeian St.
Angoon, AK 99820
Phone: 9077883653
Fax: 9077883821
E-Mail:

Lee Langstaff
RESOLVE
1255 23rd Street, N.W., Suite 275
Washington, D.C. 20037
Phone: 202/965-6210
Fax: 202/338-1264
E-Mail: llangstaff@resolv.org

Tamara I. Lundahl
P.O. Box 718
Pelican, AK 99832
Phone: 9077352452
Fax: 9077352281
E-Mail:

Richard W. Lundahl
P.O. Box 718
Pelican, AK 99832
Phone: 9077352452
Fax:
E-Mail: thehareoftacoma@yahoo.com

Jim Mackovjak
Box 63
Gustavus, AK 99826
Phone: 9076972246
Fax: 9076972248
E-Mail: jmack@seaknet.alaska.edu

Clark Millett
National Park Service
2770 Sherwood Lane, Suite I
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: 9075867047
Fax: 9075867047
E-Mail: clark_millett@nps.gov

Duff W. Mitchell
Box 35100
Juneau, AK 99803
Phone: 9075863333
Fax: 9075864444
E-Mail: sales@alaskafoods.com

Maureen Moore
P.O. Box 62
Gustavus, AK 99826
Phone: 9076972338
Fax: 9076972338
E-Mail:

Albee Moran

Phone:

Fax:

E-Mail:

Allen Morin

P.O. Box 211034

4638 Sawa Circle

Auke Bay, AK 99821

Boat: 907/789-7951

Phone: 907/789-7951

E-Mail: alohaak@aol.com

Nadine Morrison

P.O. Box 141

Hoonah, AK 99829

Phone:

Fax:

E-Mail:

Jerry Nelson

Anchorage, AK 99501

Phone: 907/245-5443

Fax:

E-Mail:

Shirley Perkins

P.O. Box 29

Elfin Cove, AK 99825

Phone: 9072392246

Fax: 9072392246

E-Mail:

Keith Pethridge

Phone:

Fax:

E-Mail:

Charles Piedra

P.O. Box 409

Pelican, AK 99832

Phone: 9077352520

Fax:

E-Mail:

John Mike Saunders

Box 1112

Haines, AK 99827

Phone: 9077662038

Fax: 9077662038

E-Mail:

Terry L. Thurbon

P.O. Box 21211

Juneau, AK 99802

Phone:

Fax:

E-Mail: tlthurbon@romea.com

Bob Tkacz

Alaska Fisherman's Journal

2 Marine Way #217

Juneau, AK 99801

Phone: 9074635455

Fax: 9074635415

E-Mail: junobob@alaska.net

Kathie Wasserman

P.O. Box 66

Pelican, AK 99832

Phone: 9077352202

Fax: 9077352258

E-Mail: katwas@aol.com

Bruce Weyhrauch

114 S. Franklin Street, Suite 200

Juneau, AK 99801

Phone: 9074635566

Fax: 9074635858

E-Mail: whyrock@pitalaska.net

Stan Wood

P.O. Box 348

Haines, AK 99827

Phone: 907/766-2119

Fax: 907/766-2114

E-Mail: woodj@seaknet.alaska.edu

Anthony Woodham
P.O. Box 488
Angoon, AK 99820
Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail: abwoodham@yahoo.com